



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/887,609 | 06/22/2001 | Adam G. Wolff | 14531.80 | 7369 |

7590 07/01/2004

RICK D. NYDEGGER
WORKMAN, NYDEGGER & SEELEY
1000 Eagle Gate Tower
60 East South Temple
Salt Lake City, UT 84111

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

PESIN, BORIS M

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2174

DATE MAILED: 07/01/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/887,609

Applicant(s)

WOLFF ET AL.

Examiner

Boris Pesin

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 April 2004.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This communication is responsive to Amendment A, filed 4/20/2004.
2. Claims 1-32 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 18, 23, and 27 are independent claims. In the Amendment A, Claims 1, 13, 18, 23 and 27 were amended.
3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-6, 23, 27, 28, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith (US 6615248) in view of Ohkura et al. (US 6005601).

In regards to claim 1, Smith teaches a computing system that includes a display screen that is capable of displaying a variety of types of media, a method for providing a dynamically controllable user interface that embraces the variety of types of media, the method comprising the acts of: displaying a menu system on the display screen (Figure 4, Element 450), wherein the menu system includes first and second categories selectable by a viewer (Figure 4, Element 451-452); displaying the first category at a selected location of the display screen (Figure 4, Element 452). Smith does not teach a method where in response to receiving a selection of the second category by the viewer, automatically replacing the first category with the second category at the selected position of the display screen. Ohkura teaches, "The user can rotate the respective areas X, Y, Z by operating the console 4 (e.g., the remote commander 4A in FIG. 7) and display desired information on a display screen shown hatched in FIG. 5."

(Column 5, Line 56). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Smith with the teachings of Ohkura in order to obtain a menu wherein one category is able to replace a second category that is already displayed in the main display area with the motivation to provide for more visible screen space and to make the selection of media choices less cumbersome for the user (Ohkura, Column 2, Line 8).

In regards to claim 2, Smith and Ohkura teach all the limitations of claim 1. Smith further teaches a method wherein the act of displaying the first category is performed by a preset, default setting (i.e. "page index area ... includes user selectable links, such as default category guide page links"(Column 7, Line 46)).

In regards to claim 3, Smith and Ohkura teach all the limitations of claim 1. Smith further teaches a method wherein the act of displaying the first category is performed upon receipt of a first input command, wherein the first input command is received prior to the input command corresponding to the selection of the second category by the viewer. (i.e. "Each of the display areas discussed has some initial, or default, state to use when system 100, implementing the present invention, is initially powered on or when a new user session is started. The initial state can be dictated by a user's formal input.", Column 10, Line 9)

In regards to claim 4, Smith and Ohkura teach all the limitations of claim 1. Smith further teaches a method for having first and second categories in a hierarchical order. (Figure 4, Element 452 and 453).

In regards to claim 5, Smith and Ohkura teach all the limitations of claim 1. Smith further teaches a method wherein the first category corresponds to a first type of media and the second category corresponds to a second type of media, and wherein the first type of media is different from the second type of media. (i.e. providing a first user selectable object via the single user interface, and providing a second user selectable object via the single user interface. The first user selectable object being a link to a first content source, and the second user selectable object being a link to a second content source, wherein the second content source differs from the first content source.”, Column 2, Line 51).

In regards to claim 6, Smith and Ohkura teach all the limitations of claim 1. Smith further teaches a method wherein the first type of media includes television programming, and wherein the second type of media includes a web page (Figure 4, Element 450, “TV” and “Web”).

In regards to claim 23, Smith teaches a menu comprising of a contextual option, which upon selection, controls an aspect of media displayed on a display device (i.e. Figure 5, Element 451 “TV”); and a static option, which upon selection, executes a mini application (i.e. search screen Figure 5, Element 420) while displaying the media on the display device, wherein the contextual option and the static option are organized in a categorical order that includes a plurality of categories (i.e. Figure 5, Element 450). Smith does not teach a method wherein each category that is selected by the user is automatically displayed at a selected position on the display screen, in response to being selected by a user, and such that a category that is not displayed at the selected

Art Unit: 2174

position automatically replaces a category that is being displayed at the selected position in response to being selected. Ohkura teaches, "The user can rotate the respective areas X, Y, Z by operating the console 4 (e.g., the remote commander 4A in FIG. 7) and display desired information on a display screen shown hatched in FIG. 5." (Column 5, Line 56). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Smith with the teachings of Ohkura in order to obtain a menu wherein one category is able to replace a second category that is already displayed in the main display area with the motivation to provide for more visible screen space and to make the selection of media choices less cumbersome for the user (Ohkura, Column 2, Line 8).

Claim 27 is in the same context as claim 1; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 28 in the same context as claim 2; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 29 is in the same context as claim 3; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 7-11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 22, 24, 25, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith (US 6615248) and Ohkura et al. (US 6005601) in view of Alten et al. (US 6661468).

In regards to claim 7, Smith and Ohkura teach all the limitations of claim 1. Smith and Ohkura lack the method wherein the act of displaying the first category

includes displaying one or more subcategories corresponding to the first category.

Alten teaches a method for displaying subcategories corresponding to the main category (Figure 6A, Element 63A, and 63(Subcategories)). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Smith and Ohkura with the teachings of Alten to include a method of having subcategories next to the categories with the motivation to provide for easier navigation of the menu system.

In regards to claim 8, Alten teaches that the subcategories are capable of scrolling horizontally (Figure 6A, 160-162).

In regards to claim 9, Smith teaches that first category corresponds to first type of media (Figure 4, Element 452).

In regards to claim 10, Alten teaches a method wherein one of the one or more subcategories corresponding to the first category includes a selectable option that performs a function specific to the first type of media (Figure 6A, 160-162).

In regards to claim 11, Alten teaches a method wherein one of the one or more subcategories corresponding to the first category includes a selectable option that initiates an application corresponding to a third type of media (i.e. messaging, Figure 6A, Element 160).

In regards to claim 13, Alten teaches a method wherein the act of automatically replacing includes replacing a display of the one or more subcategories corresponding to the first category with a display of one or more subcategories corresponding to the second category (i.e. Figure 6 shifts to figure 7 wherein the subcategories for Elements 61A and 63A are different). Alten does not teach a method of replacing the

subcategories within the selected position. However, Smith and Ohkura teach that one can have a menuing system wherein one category replaces another on the same display screen space.

Claim 14 is in the same context as claim 9; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 15 is in the same context as claim 10; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 16 is in the same context as claim 11; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

In regards to claim 18, Smith and Ohkura teach a menu system, as per claim 1, wherein a plurality of categories are displayed on the display screen and wherein the categories are capable of ratcheting such that any category from the plurality of categories that is selected by a user is automatically displayed at a selected location on the display screen, in response to being selected, while having the selected position remain constant. Smith and Ohkura do not teach a menu where there is a plurality of subcategories corresponding to the plurality of categories and wherein the only subcategories displayed on the display screen at a given instant in time are the one or more subcategories corresponding to the selected category displayed at the selected position on the display screen at the given instant in time. Alten teaches displaying subcategories corresponding to the categories (Figure 6A, Category = Element 63A, and Subcategories = Elements 160 –162), and he further teaches that the only subcategories displayed on the display screen at a given instant in time are the one or

Art Unit: 2174

more subcategories corresponding to the selected category displayed at the selected position on the display (Figure 6A, When Element 63A is selected subcategories 160-162 are displayed, in Figure 6, when Element 61A is selected, subcategories 65A-C are displayed and the other subcategories are now hidden). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Smith and Ohkura with the teachings of Alten to include a method of only displaying one set of subcategories at a given time with the motivation to make the screen less cluttered.

In regards to claim 19, Smith and Ohkura teach that the plurality of categories and a second category specific to the Internet (Smith Figure 4, Element 451 "WEB"). Smith and Ohkura do not teach a third category specific to electronic communication includes a first category specific to programming (Smith Figure 4, Element 451 "TV") Alten teaches a category for messaging, or electronic communication (Figure 6, 63). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Smith and Ohkura with the teachings of Alten to include a category for messaging to give the user more pleasurable experience by giving him more options.

In regards to claim 20, Smith and Ohkura teach that the first and second categories allow a user to launch a function to modify a display of programming (Smith Figure 4, Element 410 and 451 "TV"), and modify a display of a web page (Smith, "Web Search ... may access a web browser or possibly an Internet search engine such as Yahoo", Column 9, Line 52). Alten teaches how to launch a function and participate in electronic communication (Figure 6A, Element 160).

In regards to claim 22, Alten teaches a menu wherein at least one of the subcategories launches an application that provides current information on a selectable topic (Figure 6, Element 65A and 65B).

In regards to claim 24, Smith and Ohkura teach all the limitations of claim 23. They do not teach a menu system wherein subcategories correspond to the categories, and wherein the subcategories are selectable to a user to independently perform functions on a variety of different types of media. Alten teaches that you can have subcategories that correspond to the categories (Figure 6, Element 61) and that the subcategories are selectable to a user to perform functions on a variety different types of media (Figure 6, Element 65A, and Figure 6A, Element 160). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Smith and Ohkura with the teachings of Alten to include a method of having subcategories right next to the categories with the motivation to provide for easier navigation of the menu system.

In regards to claim 25, Smith, Ohkura and Alten teach all the limitations of claim 24. Smith further teaches that you can have web pages as a type of media (Figure 5, Element 420). Alten teaches that you can have programming (Figure 6, Element 65A) and electronic communication (Figure 6A, Element 160) as types of media.

In regards to claim 31, Smith and Ohkura teach all the limitations of claim 27. Smith and Ohkura do not teach a product wherein the first and second categories include selectable subcategories, wherein at least one of the selectable subcategories corresponds to launching an application independent of the type of media displayed in

the background display of the display screen. Alten teaches a method wherein one of the one or more subcategories corresponding to the first category includes a selectable option that initiates an application corresponding to a type of media (i.e. messaging, Figure 6A, Element 160). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Smith and Ohkura with the teachings of Alten to include a product wherein the selectable subcategories launch an application with the motivation to provide the user with the ability to multitask.

Claims 12, 17, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith (US 6615248), Ohkura et al. (US 6005601) and Alten et al. (US 6661468) in view of Chor et al. (US 6141003).

In regards to claim 12, Smith, Ohkura, and Alten teach all the limitations of claim 9. They do not teach a method comprising of displaying the first type of media in a background display of the display screen while the menu system is displayed in a foreground display of the display screen and the selected position remains constant. Chor teaches that you can have a menu in the foreground while having the main media in the background (Figure 6, Element 64 and 74). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Smith, Ohkura, and Alten with the teachings of Chor to include a way to put a menu in the foreground and the media in the background with the motivation to provide for easy access to information on what is being displayed.

Claim 17 is in the same context as claim 12; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

In regards to claim 26, Smith, Ohkura, and Alten teach all the limitations of claim 24. They do not teach a method wherein the categories are displayed in a foreground display on a display screen and at least one type of the media is displayed in a background display of the display screen. Chor teaches that you can have a menu in the foreground while having the main media in the background (Figure 6, Element 64 and 74). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Smith, Ohkura, and Alten with the teachings of Chor to include a way to put a menu in the foreground and the media in the background with the motivation to provide for easy access to information on what is being displayed.

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith (US 6615248) and Ohkura et al. (US 6005601) and Alten et al. (US 6661468) in view of Stautner et al. (US 6172677).

In regards to claim 21, Smith, Ohkura, and Alten teach all the limitations of claim 20. They do not teach a menu system wherein subcategories corresponding to the third category allows a user to participate in electronic communication while at least one of programming or a web page is displayed on the display screen. Stautner teaches that you can have a chat session, or electronic communication, and be viewing a television program at the same time (Figure 3, Element 100). It would have been obvious to one

Art Unit: 2174

of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Smith, Ohkura, and Alten with the teachings of Stautner to include a method for simultaneous electronic communication and displaying programming with the motivation to allow the user to multitask on one screen.

Claims 30 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith (US 6615248) and Ohkura et al. (US 6005601) in view of Chor et al. (US 6141003).

In regards to claim 30, Smith and Ohkura teach all the limitations of claim 27. They do not teach the act of displaying the menu system in a foreground display of the display screen while displaying a type of media in a background display of the display screen. Chor teaches that you can have a menu in the foreground while having the main media in the background (Figure 6, Element 64 and 74). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Smith and Ohkura with the teachings of Chor to include a way to put a menu in the foreground and the media in the background with the motivation to provide for easy access to information on what is being displayed and being able to multitask.

In regards to claim 32, Smith, Ohkura and Chor teach all the limitations of claim 30. Smith further teaches a method wherein the first category corresponds to a first type of media that is displayable on the display screen and wherein the second category includes options that correspond to a second type of media that is displayable on the display screen. (i.e. "providing a first user selectable object via the single user interface,

and providing a second user selectable object via the single user interface. The first user selectable object being a link to a first content source, and the second user selectable object being a link to a second content source, wherein the second content source differs from the first content source.", Column 2, Line 51).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-32 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Boris Pesin whose telephone number is (703) 305-8774. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday except every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on (703) 308-0640. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100